

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action of December 21, 2004, in which claims 1-24 are presently pending. With regard to the art of record, each of claims 1-24 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0016061 to Preston, et al. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

At the outset, the Applicants would like to express their appreciation for the manner in which the Examiner's analysis of the pending claim language has been set forth in the present Office Action (i.e., the "claim chart" format that renders the Examiner's findings easier to follow for purposes of responding thereto).

In response to the present action, each of the independent claims 1, 9 and 17 has been amended to include the language "reiterating one or more of the above steps so as to render the high-level language in conformance with the customer requirements." Support for this amendment is found at least in page 4, paragraph [0013] and in page 7, paragraph [0019] of the specification.

The iterative nature of the presently claimed method embodiments is neither taught nor suggested in the Preston publication. For example, in Figure 3b of Preston, the example of function definition and description capability of the data is specific to phone calls, and is further illustrated with relatively short, mostly declarative sentences. There is thus an implication of validity of the utterance, insofar as no feedback is illustrated for checking purposes. Nor is there any teaching of relating back to the call if anything fails.

Finally, the Applicant also respectfully traverses the Examiner's additional §103 rejection of claim 8 (and claims 16 and 24), reciting the implementation of a first order predicate calculus. Although a person of ordinary skill in the art might know of first and second order predicate calculus, in and of itself, there no teaching or suggestion in

Preston to tie the semantic mapping defined in the claims herein with the argument-checking or "logic" validation found when complementing the semantic analysis with a first order predicate calculus analysis at the same time. In response to the Examiner's statement on page 4 of the Office Action, the application of the first order predicate calculus is taught at least in paragraph [0020] of the specification.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0458 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,
KEVIN MINERLEY

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicant's Attorneys

By



Sean F. Sullivan
Registration No. 38,328
Customer No. 46429

Date: March 16, 2005
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929